DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 390 HE 021 254

AUTHOR	Larson, Jon
TITLE	Senior Administrator Attitudes about Planning. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Nov 87
NOTE	86p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Baltimore, MD, November 21-24, 1987). Best copy available.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; *College Planning; Community Colleges; Decision Making; Higher Education; Institutional Mission; *Long Range Planning; Private Colleges; Questionnaires; Research Universities; School Surveys; State Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

Initial results of the survey research phase of a 3-year study of institutional planning in higher education are presented. The Institutional Planning Project was undertaken by the National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance. The national survey examined administrators' attitudes on planning and their perceptions of the planning approaches employed at their campus. A total of 256 institutions were surveyed that represented research universities, private colleges, state colleges, and community colleges. Questionnaire responses were received from 1,528 administrators representing 20 administrative positions. The objective was to develop research-based guidelines and recommendations for the design, implementation, and assessment of planning approaches and processes at colleges and universities. Of concern has been self-studies and evaluations, policy plans developed by standing committees or issue-oriented task forces, and administrative decisions and actions, as well as formally designated planning processes. Appendices include the questionnaire and data file format. A total of 135 references are included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED292390

ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Senior Administrator Attitudes About Planning

Jon Larson, Ph.D.

Research Associate
National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance
University of Maryland
6535 Belcrest Road, Suite 430
Hyattsville, Maryland 20782

October 21, 1987

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jon Larson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

NE 021 254

The project reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the Department of Education (OERI/ED). However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the OERI/ED and no official endorsement by the OERI/ED should be inferred.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ASHE

ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Sheraton Inner Harbor Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland, November 21-24, 1987. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

PROJECT ABSTRACT

This paper describes the survey research phase of a three-year study of institutional planning in higher education undertaken by the National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance.

The major goal of the Institutional Planning Project, the title of the three-year study, is to develop a coherent set of research-based guidelines and recommendations for designing, implementing and assessing issues, planning processes and structures in higher education institutions. The information developed by the project will be directed at assisting the planning efforts of administrators seeking to improve the educational quality of their institutions and facilitating campus adaptations to changing conditions. In addition, the research findings should benefit scholars attempting to develop workable planning methodologies for colleges and universities.

The project has focused upon the broad range of planning activities used by colleges and universities in setting directions and responding to new demands and trends. These activities include self-studies and evaluations, policy plans developed by standing committees or issue-oriented task forces, and administrative decisions and actions, as well as formally designated planning processes. The project has sought to address several research questions, including: What are the planning-related values, attitudes and behaviors of key campus actors and constituencies? How do individual variables, such as administrative role,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

education, formal training in planning methods, and length of administrative experience affect the attitudes, orientations and behaviors of college and university administrators? What affect does the institutional type, enrollment size, and perceived financial and enrollment health of the campus have upon administrators' perspectives of planning systems and approaches? Do the assumptions that underlie a campus' existing planning approach match those underlying the orientations of campus administrators? What roles do campus organization and governance and academic traditions play in addressing the needs and concerns generally associated with formal planning?

To address these questions the project is conducting three major research efforts: 1) a large-scale survey of planning attitudes of key organizational actors and constituencies in 256 institutions; 2) a review and systematic analysis of literature on institutional planning experiences; and 3) an in-depth examination of planning perspectives and activities at 16 institutions of different types and governance patterns.

Based on the research findings, the project will prepare assessments of the potential strengths and weaknesses of current planning theories, approaches and methods. The project will also develop sets of guidelines and recommendations aimed at improving the practice of planning in various types of higher education institutions. These products will be presented in a variety of articles, summary reports, and workshop and conference presentations that specifically address the needs and interests of particular scholarly and practitioner audiences.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
	TITLE PAGE	i
	ABSTRACT	ii
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
	LIST OF TABLES	vi
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Objectives of the Study	1
	The Survey	2
	Background of the Research Issues	3
	Significance of the Research	8
	Limitations of the Study	8
	Assumptions and Definitions	9
II.	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	13
	Planning Attitudes and Perceptions	13
III.	METHODOLOGY	18
	Sample Selection	18
	Position Titles Surveyed	19
	Questionnaire Design	20
	Survey Administration	21
IV.	DATA ANALYSIS	23
	Summary	23
	Frequency Distributions	24
	Titles Surveyed	25
	Enrollment	27
	Years in Higher Education	27
	Years in Current Role	28
	Academic Discipline	29
	Training in Planning Methods	29
	Senior Planning Officer	30
	Planning Activities	31
	Necessity for Planning	32
	Feasibility of Planning	32
	Reasons for Planning	33
	Contingency Table Analysis	34
	Regression Analysis	38

Planning Attitude Model 38
Regression Model I 41
Regression Model II 44
Regression Model III 45
Controlling for Institutional Size 47

V. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS 49

VII. APPENDICES

A. SURVEY DOCUMENTS 55

1. Cover Page
2. Questionnaire
3. Data File Format
4. Letter to Presidents
5. Association Sponsors and Letter

B. DATA FILE FORMAT 56

VIII. REFERENCES 57

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE
1	Institutional Types	25
2	Position Titles Surveyed	26
3	Positions by Institution Type	26
4	Institution Size	27
5	Years in Higher Education	28
6	Years in Current Role	28
7	Academic Discipline	29
8	Training in Planning Methods	30
9	Senior Planning Role Staffing	31
10	Participation in Campus Planning	31
11	Necessity for Planning	32
12	Feasibility of Planning	33
13	Reasons for Planning	34
14	Planning Attitude by Decision Making Attitude	35
15	Perceptions of Planning and Decision Making	35
16	Perceptions of Planning Constraints	36
17	Perceptions of Planning Practices by Attitudes	37
18	Regression Summary Table: PLAT6	39
19	Regression Table: PAPP6	39
20	Regression Table: PLAT	40
21	Regression Table: PAPP	40
22	Regression Table: Attitude Scale	41

23 Regression Table: Perception of Practices Scale 41

24 Regression Table: Regression Model I 42

25 Regression Table: Regression Model II 45

26 Regression Table: Regression Model III 46

INTRODUCTION

This report provides a description of the Institutional Planning Project and preliminary results of the findings of the project's national survey.

Objectives of the Study

The project's objectives are to develop a coherent set of guidelines and recommendations for designing, implementing and assessing planning issues, planning processes and organizational structures for planning in higher education institutions. The project's focus is upon the broad range of planning activities used by colleges and universities in setting directions and responding to new demands and trends. These activities include a wide variety of institutional direction-setting processes, including self-studies and evaluations, policy plans developed by standing committees or issue-oriented task forces, and administrative decisions and actions, as well as formally designated planning processes. The project has sought to address several research questions, including: What are the planning-related values, attitudes and behaviors of key campus actors and constituencies? How do individual variables, such as administrative role, education, formal training in planning methods, and length of administrative experience affect the attitudes, orientations and behaviors of college and university administrators? What affect

does the institutional type, enrollment size, and perceived financial and enrollment health of the campus have upon administrators' perspectives of planning systems and approaches? Do the assumptions that underlie a campus' existing planning approach match those underlying the orientations of campus administrators? What roles do campus organization and governance and academic traditions play in addressing the needs and concerns generally associated with formal planning?

To address these questions the project is conducting three major research efforts: 1) a large-scale survey of planning attitudes of key organizational actors and constituencies in 256 institutions; 2) a review and systematic analysis of literature on institutional planning experiences; and 3) an in-depth examination of planning perspectives and activities at 16 institutions of different types and governance patterns.

Based on the research findings, the project will prepare assessments of the potential strengths and weaknesses of current planning theories, approaches and methods and will develop sets of guidelines and recommendations aimed at improving the practice of planning in various types of higher education institutions.

The Survey

The survey component of the Institutional Planning Project was designed to obtain a broad base of information about the perspectives of practicing administrators on planning at their campuses, as well as on their own views about planning. The

survey was based on the premise that attitudes, behaviors and interactions among policy-makers significantly influence the governance and management processes of America's collegiate campuses. Accordingly, the survey sought to identify, from these perspectives and views about planning, some common characteristics of institutional planning, with special attention to the processes, values, and limitations of various planning approaches. It was assumed that these efforts would, at a minimum, broaden and enrich our understanding of the conditions under which certain planning approaches are apt to be more realistic and practical than other approaches. At best, the study would lead to the resolution of fundamental issues and beliefs about the usefulness and efficacy of certain root notions or concepts of planning methodology, including the idea that rational, analytical techniques are inherently better than the more traditional bargaining, market-oriented, or political-process planning techniques.

Background of the Research Issues

Although a substantial body of literature on planning exists, little empirical research has been conducted on planning processes and planning behavior in higher education institutions. Much of the available literature on planning assumes an advocacy position, exhorting college and university administrators to utilize one form or another of goal-oriented methods of planning (Georgiou, 1973). Some writers have advocated political-process or market-exchange models that are conceptually antithetical to systematic,

analytical-technical models (Ashley and Van de Ven, 1983).

A central objective of this study was to assess the extent to which these two contrasting approaches to planning, political-market and technical-analytical, characterize the perceived conduct of planning in American colleges and universities or characterize the attitudes toward planning held by administrators. Schmidtlein (1979) has identified the assumptions that underlie these two approaches and has defined ideal types or paradigms of planning and decision making values and processes (1974). These paradigms are labeled Comprehensive-Prescriptive and Incremental-Remedial.

The assumptions that underlie Comprehensive-Prescriptive approaches to planning and decision making include:

1. Sufficient agreement to permit institutional consensus on goals and priorities can be derived from the persuasive effects of technical analyses of problems, goals and institutional strategies.
2. The subject matters with which planning is concerned are sufficiently understandable that causal relationships can be determined, the means to control change can be developed, and outcomes can be identified, measured and controlled.
3. Economic, social, human and information resources necessary to design, implement and evaluate plans will be or can be available.
4. Sufficient time exists to use technical methods to

analyze change, meet deadlines and evaluate competing priorities.

5. Outcomes, results and consequences of planning serve both the interests and needs of the key participants and the institution.

The assumptions that underlie Incremental-Remedial approaches to planning and decision making include:

1. Conflict over values, problems, goals, change, ideologies and expectations is likely within the institutional planning process.
2. Decision processes seek to diffuse and decentralize conflicts and reach consensus through negotiation and mutual accommodation.
3. Understanding the nature of a policy issue and the subject matters of various planning questions is discovered through reactions and repeated attempts at compromise, so the process is essentially remedial.
4. The question of whose interests will be served by establishing priorities is resolved through political bargaining processes, not by central authority utilizing technical methods of analysis.
5. Limitations of time and other constraints on analysis are recognized. Actors are assumed to "satisfice" (Simon, 1945) through complex trade-offs unique to particular circumstances.
6. Inconsistency is assumed to characterize organizational

behavior, providing for conflicting values to coexist and allowing experimentation in the face of uncertainty.

7. Central policy makers are assumed to have diminished accountability for policy decisions which are shared with those affected by them.

Schmidtlein (1979) has identified several reasons for a widespread growth of interest in planning in recent years. These include acceptance of central planning by the business community which has increased the legitimacy of planning among liberals and conservatives, the development of statewide higher education coordinating boards, influences of planning advocates and the popularity of books about planning approaches, growth in the size and complexity of higher education and the development of technical and managerial tools and systems designed to control these factors, and the perceived shortcomings of the political marketplace.

Planning in higher education is a complex subject that is difficult to study experimentally. Accordingly, this study uses a non-experimental approach to the research. The focus of the study was on the relationship between the individual beliefs and attitudes of administrators, who are the chief actors in college and university planning, and the broader, macro-level characteristics of the planning processes of higher education institutions. The study attempted to learn what factors influence administrators' attitudes about planning and what relationships exist between these attitudes and the actual planning processes of academic institutions.

A fundamental question addressed in the research was how attitudes about planning and perceptions of actual planning processes are distributed among administrators. Are there differences associated with institutional characteristics? The anticipated finding was that basic attitudes are fairly randomly distributed and that perceptions of actual campus processes would vary according to the approaches in use.

A secondary research question was whether the orientations toward planning among top academic policy makers differed from those of other campus administrative groups in ways that were related to their role responsibilities. The use of attitudinal-based measures as indices of behavior is supported by sociological and psychological research on attitudes (Hovland and Rosenberg, 1960; Rokeach, 1968). The study anticipated that role experience would be found to be a factor that conditioned basic attitudes, resulting in more perceptions among top administrators that campuses' actual planning processes were Incremental-Remedial than among other administrator groups.

A third research question addressed whether other factors that literature on planning suggests has an effect on the behavior of planners, including longevity, role incumbency, training in planning methods (Jedamus and Peterson, 1980), involvement in campus planning activities, attitudes about decision making (Allison, 1971; Benveniste, 1977), and perceived constraints to planning (Dyckman, 1961; Lindblom and Braybrooke, 1965), affected the association of basic attitudes and perceptions of campus

processes.

A fourth research question addressed whether institutional size, measured by student enrollment, and the type of institution, measured by highest degree awarded and governance patterns, also affect the perceptions of administrators about campus planning processes. Literature on planning and policy making suggests that small, homogeneous institutions are more well-suited to centrally-managed decision processes than large, heterogeneous institutions (Van Ausdale, 1980; Dye, 1981; Etzioni, 1968).

Significance of the Research

The research has potential significance both in practical and scholarly terms. The study deals with a subject of importance to higher education managers. Evaluating programs for accountability (Astin, 1974) and analyzing institutional outcomes in self studies (Kells, 1980; Kieft, Armijo, and Bucklew, 1978)) are currently real concerns for those responsible for leading higher education institutions. Scholarly concerns which the research may illuminate include debates about the "tension" between "rational" and "political" planning approaches (Cope, 1981; Keller, 1983; Richardson and Gardner, 1985) and the study of organization theory, administrative behavior, decision making, role theory and policy analysis (Beer, 1966; Wahlke, 1962; Wildavsky, 1964; Fenno, 1966).

Limitations of the Study

The survey sample is not statistically representative of the

general population of higher education institutions, although it is widely representative. Therefore, generalizations must be constrained both by considerations of the variation apt to be found in individual cases and by the knowledge that some institutional types may be under-represented.

Assumptions and Definitions

The research assumes that attitudes are measurable and that administrative behavior is shaped by the interaction of attitudes and perceptions of the environment. Planning is assumed to be an administrative function of colleges and universities as a variation of policy making and implementation which involves decision making for future-focused issues. It is assumed that those who are involved in planning exhibit behavior and hold beliefs that lead to behavior designed to influence policy and planning decisions on the basis of some value perspective within the range defined by the comprehensive-prescriptive, incremental-remedial paradigm.

In this report, the following terms are intended to have the these meanings:

Attitudes: are predispositions of persons to respond in a particular way toward a class of objects or phenomena (Hovland and Rosenberg, 1960).

Cognitive balance: is a state of harmony between attitudes and cognitively understood perceptions of phenomena (Jaros and Grant, 1974).

Cognitive consistency: is a logical coherence between

attitudes and cognitively understood perceptions of phenomena (McGuire, 1966).

Cognitive dissonance: is a state of discord between basic attitudes and cognitively understood perceptions of phenomena (Festinger, 1957; Bem, 1970).

Cognitive Framework: is a logical and consistent pattern of organizing information received, or perceptions of phenomena, so that they may be understood (Schmidtlein, 1973).

Control: is the activity of assuring that the values selected for inputs in a plan are producing the desired outputs, or that specified objectives are being realized (Eide, 1969).

Decisions: are choices or selections of one or more alternatives from some set or class of alternatives (Jaros and Grant, 1974).

Decision making: is selecting outcomes from an array of choices, or the fixing of the values of a system's output variables (Eide, 1969).

Forecasting: is estimating the values of a system's output variables (goals, objectives, or outcomes), when the values of the input variables are given (Eide, 1969).

Groups: are collections of individual persons who share at least one common characteristic, e.g., a category (job), an interaction (club), a formal organization (AAUP chapter), or an attitude or value orientation (environmentalists) (Truman, 1951).

Ideology: is a belief system or a sophisticated set of interrelated concepts enabling a person to find coherent and

consistent meaning in a wide range of events (Lane, 1962).

Implementation: is the carrying out of decisions to accomplish plans, or the practical manipulation of input variables according to an established program (Eide, 1969).

Orientations: are structured sets of higher-order evaluative attitudes, or predispositions of persons to respond in a consistent way toward a class of phenomena (Jaros and Grant, 1974).

Perceptions: are intuitive recognitions, understandings, interpretations, or discoveries which result from the filtering or organizing of information within a conceptual framework (Schmidtlein, 1974; Bem, 1970).

Planning: is an activity involving research, forecasting, decision making, programming, implementation and control, in which a model is used to simulate the consistency between input and output variable values (Eide, 1969).

Incremental-Remedial planning: is characterized by attention given to processes rather than to systems. It is an approach that usually focuses attention upon the margins of the status quo, restricts consideration of the variety of alternatives and outcomes to a few, makes successive limited comparisons of means to ends, continually amends choices as trials require remediation, and that fragments or pluralizes the decision process (Lindblom and Braybrooke, 1963).

Comprehensive-Prescriptive planning: is characterized by attention given to technical and analytical systems rather than to political or market processes. It is an approach in which means and

ends are explicitly defined, are logically consistent and cover a broad range of alternatives. This approach to planning usually entails formal analysis of costs and benefits and prescribes detailed goals and objectives that are often forecast into a long-range future (Churchman, 1983; Schultze, 1968).

Policies: are the principles upon which a class of decisions, actions, or other measures are based (Lindblom, 1968).

Programming: is estimating the values of a planning model's input variables when the values of the output variables, or goals, are given or defined (Eide, 1969).

Research: is the systematic study of factors which affect the costs and benefits of alternatives, or analysis of the determinants of structural relationships within a planning model (Eide, 1969).

Roles: are the norms of behavior for social or occupational positions which are expected by others and by the role players. The role concept assumes that an established institutional structure of such behavioral norms governs interpersonal relations (Wahlke, 1962; Merton, 1957).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study tested the hypothesis that as administrators assume higher level policy making roles, they modify their orientation to planning or find that it is reinforced, by accommodating constraints found in the campus planning environment. Fundamental normative concepts of planning are reinforced or are adjusted as the administrator attempts to conform to the norms of and expectations for these policy making roles. Campus influences include constraints upon time, resources, and knowledge as well as difficulties in achieving consensus over planning values in a pluralistic policy making process characterized by conflict among groups over substantive values. Expectations of senior administrators role occupants to achieve policy consensus encourages them to act as brokers. This function of leadership includes compromise during the process of allocating institutional resources among groups and individuals with diverse interests, both within the institution and outside its boundaries.

Attitudes and Perceptions

This study postulated that administrators' basic attitudes interact with and are affected by this campus policy making experience in the pluralistic, marketplace environment of group interests. The norms for senior administrative roles influence the role occupant to reflect the established values of the

organization. Like other public organizations, colleges and universities expect their chief policy makers to act in ways that accommodate the interests of diverse groups that can affect the welfare of the institution (Sharkansky, 1969).

Prior research has shown that roles and attitudes are highly correlated, that attitudes change, and that role change is accompanied by corresponding changes in attitudes (Festinger, 1957; Rokeach, 1968; McGuire, 1969). Moreover, attitudes may be derived from behavior. Individuals may infer their own attitudes from their behavior. "Playing a new role not only changes one's opinions toward external issues, it also affects one's perception of himself(Bem, 1970, p.66). Rokeach has concluded that behavior with respect to an activity (such as planning) is a function of two attitudes: that toward the activity itself and that toward the situation within which the object is encountered (Rokeach, 1968). Furthermore, the two attitudes interact. Accordingly, behavior will be a function of the relative importance of the situation and of the activity. One's attitude about planning might remain quite stable across various situational contexts if that attitude is highly important in the structure of one's beliefs and values. Conversely, one's attitude about planning might be modified if commitment to that attitude were discordant with a highly values situation, especially where the attitude is not highly ingrained in the value structure of the individual's personality. Therefore, the role context within which top academic leaders undertake institutional planning is likely to have a strong influence upon

them, particularly when their underlying attitudes are not highly structured. If the institutional context or the environment of collegial leadership across types of institutions is strongly committed to formal planning approaches using highly technical and analytical methods, these contextual influences will affect and modify loosely-held attitudes or reinforce strongly held attitudes favoring such approaches. Conversely, if the context is more political and market process oriented, basing planning decisions on bargained consensus over goals, then academic leaders with loosely held attitudes about planning will be influenced to support such approaches, while those with strongly held opinions will experience reinforcement or tremendous stress resulting from the conflict of values. Rokeach suggests that when such cognitive dissonance occurs and a person's self esteem and values are placed in conflict with the logic of cognitive consistency, cognitive consistency is likely to temporarily give way in favor of preserving self esteem.

One objective of this study was to assess the changes in outlook, or planning orientation, resulting from conflict between role experience and attitudes about planning. A crucial objective was the measurement of disparities between lower order, underlying attitudes and higher order, evaluative attitudes, or orientations, toward planning (Hovland and Rosenberg, 1960); the latter having been shaped by the behavioral and social aspects of the policy making or leadership role.

A central issue in planning theory concerns the proper relative emphasis upon rationality, or means-ends consistency

(Eide, 1969; Schmidtlein, 1974). Comprehensive-prescriptive and incremental-remedial approaches to planning differ most fundamentally on this issue. Cognitive consistency theorists have generally argued that man maintains a system of attitudes and possesses a drive toward logical consistency within this world view or system of values. Other psychologists have argued that a permanent state of attitudinal inconsistency in the individual person is commonplace (Abelson, 1968; Bem, 1970). Political scientists have found abundant evidence that cognitive and attitudinal inconsistency characterizes the political views of individuals (Campbell, Converse, Miller and Stokes, 1964). Incremental-remedial planning approaches require that a relatively high level of ambiguity and cognitive inconsistency be tolerated (Lindblom, 1968). Conversely, comprehensive-prescriptive planning approaches require that a rather high level of cognitive consistency be maintained (Freidland, 1974; Wildavsky, 1966). This project attempted to assess the degree to which administrators maintain attitudinal consistency or tolerate cognitive inconsistency.

Schmidtlein has cited constraints to logical consistency in decision making that results from the conceptual frameworks within which decision makers operate. Each decision reached by an individual requires an assessment of the current state of affairs, definition of a preferred state, and design of an action strategy to establish a "more favorable balance of exchange between the decision maker and his environment" (1973, p.34). Because even

quite simple choices entail debilitating uncertainties at each of these steps, "individuals tend to make incremental changes in the current states of affairs based on very limited goals and then to evaluate the results of these changes (1973, p.35). Such partial analysis and tentative decision making results in continual revisions. New understandings emerge as evaluations of changes occurs. New assessments of the current state result in new definitions of the preferred state. Thus goals are interactively redefined in a dynamic sequence of assessments (Schmidtlein, 1973). This environment is characterized by a complex interplay of exchanges. Transactions occur among both individuals and formal and informal groups. Exchanges occur both internally and externally to the institutions boundaries. Frequently, transactions are both official and personal simultaneously. Benefits often serve personal as well as organizational purposes. This model of the collegiate environment depicts institutions more as an "ecology of games" (Long, 1958) than as a "social unit oriented toward the realization of specific goals" (Etzioni, 1960, p.273). These "polyarchal" (Dahl, 1956) decision processes are inherent in the democratic process (Lindblom and Braybrooke, 1965).

Juxtaposed to this conception of the collegiate environment is the centralized, rationalistic, analytical, ends-oriented "goal paradigm" (Georgiou, 1973). The goal paradigm is based on an elitist conception of the decision process (Dye, 1973). In this paradigm, democratic process and democratic values are subordinated to the logic of structuring consistent means-ends relationships

(Broms and Gahmberg, 1983). This research sought to learn if the polyarchal democratic decision making environment of collegiate institutions influences academic leaders to plan in ways more characterized by the incremental-remedial paradigm than the comprehensive-prescriptive paradigm.

METHODOLOGY

Sample Selection

The sampling procedure for this study included selecting respondents according to the type of institution within which they were employed. Four types were used: 1) research universities, 2) private colleges, 3) state colleges and 4) community colleges. Sixty four institutions in each category were selected. In total, two hundred fifty six institutions were surveyed.

Each category was stratified into at least two sub-categories. For example, research universities selected included 32 public and 32 private institutions. These were randomly drawn from the population of all research universities listed in the Higher Education Directory (1986), published by Higher Education Publications (HEP). Private colleges selected included 32 independent, 4-year institutions awarding the Bachelor's degree; 32 private colleges were also selected that were formally affiliated with a religion. State colleges were selected in two categories of 32 institutions: single campus institutions and multi-campus systems; in addition, each category of state colleges was further

divided into two sub-categories of 16 institutions: those with unionized and those with non-unionized faculty. Sixty four community colleges were stratified according to the same criteria as state colleges. Institutions with unionized faculty were identified using the Directory of Faculty Contracts and Bargaining Agents in Institutions of Higher Education (1985), published by the National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions, City University of New York. Campuses were classified into system or non-system categories according to a framework provided by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA).

Position Titles Surveyed

For each campus drawn in the sample, incumbent administrators in up to twenty position titles were surveyed (if there was a person employed by the institution in the listed position). It should be noted that because larger institutions more often employ more of these administrators than small institutions, the number of persons surveyed who work in large institutions was greater than the number employed in small institutions. The position titles surveyed are listed below.

1) Member, Board of Trustees
2) Chief Executive Officer
3) Chief Academic Officer
4) Registrar
5) Director of Admissions
6) Head Librarian
7) Director, Institutional Research
8) Chief Business Officer
9) Director, Computer Center
10) Director, Alumni Relations

11) Chief Development Officer
12) Chief Student Services Officer
13) Director of Counseling
14) Director, Financial Aid
15) Chief Planning Officer
16) Dean/Division Head, College/Program 1
17) Dean/Division Head, College/Program 2
18) Dean/Division Head, College/Program 3
19) Dean/Division Head, College/Program 4
20) Dean/Division Head, College/Program 5

The sample of institutions selected was not necessarily representative of the distribution of each type of campus among all institutions, but it did contain a sufficient number to obtain good information about the considerable variations in planning practices in American higher education. Because the proportion of institutions surveyed to the total number of institutions in each category did vary from category to category, and because the number of position titles found at the campuses also tended to vary by size and type of institution, generalizations about the populations from these samples must be tempered by awareness of these variations. However, the research findings are not offered as definitive answers to planning questions, but rather as stimulating suggestions for further qualitative study and evaluation, aspects to be explored in the site visit phase of the project.

Questionnaire Design

The survey questionnaire was based on a survey instrument used in Larson's (1985) study of faculty and administrators' planning attitudes and orientations in 54 colleges and universities in the state of Maryland. The questionnaire (see Appendix A) includes background items that previous research and

theory suggest may be related to administrator planning perspectives and behavior (questions 1-6). It also includes questions about administrator views of the purposes of campus-wide planning and the conditions under which planning is believed to be most necessary and most feasible (questions 7-8). Additionally, several questions are included that assess the respondents' attitudes and values about organizational decision making (questions 11a-11f) and their perceptions of the actual approaches to planning and decision making at their campuses. Perceptions of limitations to effective planning that may exist at the respondents' campuses are also surveyed (question 10). The use of "is" and "should be" scales for the decision making and planning process questions was designed to allow comparison of individual and group attitudes with perceptions of the actual practices of the respondents' institutions.

Survey Administration

A cover page accompanied the mailing of each personally-addressed questionnaire (see Appendix A). A general overview of the project and its purposes was included, as well as specific information regarding the recipients' role in the survey. The names of seven associations which agreed to sponsor the project were listed on the cover page. They included the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC), the National Association of

Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU), and the National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities (NIICU). A pre-paid return envelope was included in the survey package.

A computer data base was created for administering the survey mailing and for collecting and analyzing responses (see Appendix B). This data base includes both information required to mail the questionnaire to 3,333 college and university administrators and coded information derived from the survey responses. The data is maintained on the University of Maryland IBM 3081 computer in an SPSS-X data file. The data was entered in an AT&T 6300+ microcomputer, using SPSS/PC+ with Data Entry. Statistical analysis was accomplished using SPSS/PC+ and SPSS/PC+ Graphics. At the conclusion of the project, the data and the SPSS analysis programs, in SPSS-X format, will be up-loaded to the University of Maryland Computer Science Center IBM 3081, where it will be available to other researchers who may wish to utilize the data or replicate the analyses.

Two survey mailings were conducted. The first was completed in November, 1986 and the second in March, 1987. A telephone survey of selected non-respondents will be conducted during the fall of 1987 to obtain information on possible differences between respondents and non-respondents with respect to critical variables in the study. The results of a comparison analysis of this non-respondent information will be included in the final report of the survey findings.

DATA ANALYSIS

Analysis of the data has focused on identifying significant information about the planning practices and perspectives of administrators within the four basic institutional types (and their several sub-groupings). The analysis has sought to present information considered to be most useful and relevant for practitioners and scholars concerned with improving planning in higher education institutions. The project statistical consultant, Dr. Henry Walbesser, Chair, Department of Information Services Management at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County, has assisted in the design of specific analytic procedures and will review all statistical findings and interpretations of results prior to the final project report.

Summary

Data analysis procedures have included developing descriptive tables, charts and figures derived from frequency distributions of the data collected from questionnaire responses. Associations and relationships among the variables defined for use in the analysis were explored through contingency table analysis. Group means and standard deviations were examined to assess differences with one- and two-way analysis of variance. Data were re-coded in instances where analytical clarity was aided by creating fewer categories within a variable and new variables were created by computing scale

totals, scale averages, and by combining variables. The predictive power and explanatory utility of three regression models was also explored. The research design had hypothesized that several factors may aid in explaining variation in administrators' planning attitudes and perceptions of campus planning practices. Accordingly, a scale consisting of six questions was developed to measure administrators' underlying attitudes toward planning within the range of processes, methods, and values from Comprehensive-Prescriptive to Incremental-Remedial. A second scale, also using the Schmidtlein (1974) paradigm, measured administrators' perceptions of the actual planning practices and the predominate values regarding planning on their campuses. Two additional scales were devised to measure attitudes about organizational decision making and perceptions of the actual decision making processes and values on the respondents' campuses. A fifth scale was developed to measure perceptions of campus-based limitations to or constraints on planning. These scales were checked for reliability and have been used in both the descriptive analyses and in the regression models.

Frequency Distributions

The data from the survey are shown below in tables and figures to describe the characteristics of the responses received to each question in the survey.

Institution Type

In each of four major sub-categories of colleges and universities: 1) research universities, 2) private colleges, 3) state colleges and 4) community colleges, 64 institutions were selected to be surveyed. Responses received are displayed in Table 1 by percentage according to the type of institution surveyed. Up to 20 administrators were mailed questionnaires at each institution.

Table 1

RESPONSES BY INSTITUTION TYPE

INSTITUTION SIZE	Responses	%
Under 2,501	384	25.1
2,501 - 5,000	244	16.0
5,001 - 10,000	338	22.1
10,001 - 20,000	351	23.0
Above 20,000	211	13.8
Totals	1,528	100.0

Titles Surveyed

Frequency distributions for the position titles surveyed and the responses received are listed in Table 2.

Larger institutions tend more frequently than small colleges, especially community colleges, to employ administrators in all of most of the maximum of 20 administrative positions to which questionnaires were issued (provided the institution listed the position and an incumbent in the Higher Education Directory). As a result, more persons working at large campuses were surveyed.

Table 2

POSITIONS TITLES SURVEYED AND RESPONSES

TITLE	Surveyed	Responses	Rate	%
1) Trustee	256	55	21.5%	3.6
2) Chief Executive	256	108	42.2	7.1
3) Academic VP	245	137	55.9	9.0
4) Registrar	175	94	53.7	6.2
5) Dir/Admissions	159	73	45.9	4.8
6) Head Librarian	222	105	47.3	6.9
7) Dir/Inst Res	113	68	60.2	4.5
8) Business VP	249	113	45.4	7.4
9) Dir/Computer Ctr	149	54	36.2	3.5
10) Dir/Alumni	121	48	39.7	3.1
11) Development Off	149	63	42.3	4.1
12) Stud Serv's VP	233	117	50.2	7.7
13) Dir/Counseling	100	39	39.0	2.6
14) Dir/Fin Aid	186	90	48.4	5.9
15) Planning Off	47	27	57.4	1.8
16) Dean/Div Head	519	266	51.2	17.4
17) Chair	76	33	43.4	2.2
18) Director	78	38	48.7	2.5
Totals	3,333	1,528	45.8%	100.0

In Table 3, titles by institution type are presented.

Table 3
POSITIONS SURVEYED BY INSTITUTION TYPE

INSTITUTION TYPE	N	Titles	Responses	Rate	%
Research University, Private	32	558	250	44.8	16.4
Research University, Public	32	535	263	49.2	17.2
Private College, Independent	32	338	132	39.0	8.6
Private College, Religious	32	332	149	44.9	9.8
State College, System	32	455	209	45.9	13.7
State College, Non-System	32	453	212	46.8	13.8
Community College, System	32	298	130	43.6	8.5
Community College, Non-System	32	364	183	50.3	12.0
Totals	256	3,333	1,528	45.8	100.0

Enrollment

Table 4 provides the distribution of enrollments among the survey respondents, arranged into five institutional size categories.

Table 4

RESPONSES BY INSTITUTION SIZE

INSTITUTION SIZE	Responses	%
Under 2,501	384	25.1
2,501 - 5,000	244	16.0
5,001 - 10,000	338	22.1
10,001 - 20,000	351	23.0
Above 20,000	211	13.8
Totals	1,528	100.0

Over half (55%) of the students enrolled among all institutions surveyed were enrolled at research universities. Community colleges enrolled 24% of the students; state colleges enrolled 16%; and private colleges enrolled 5% of the total student population at the 256 institutions surveyed.

Years in Higher Education

The relative experience in higher education of the survey respondents was very high. Nearly a third of the 1,528 respondents had been employed in a college or university for over twenty years. Table 5 provides the distribution of responses in four categories of longevity in higher education.

Table 5

RESPONSES BY CATEGORIES OF
YEARS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

YEARS IN HIGHER EDUCATION	Responses	%
1 - 5	130	8.5
6 - 10	177	11.6
11 - 20	680	44.5
Above 20	496	32.5
Missing	45	2.9
Totals	1,528	100.0

Years in Current Role

Over two-thirds of the respondents had been in their current job for ten years or less, and nearly half of the respondents had been in their current role for five years or less. Table 6 reveals the distribution of responses by years the incumbents had held their current jobs.

Table 6

RESPONSES BY CATEGORIES OF
YEARS IN CURRENT ROLE

YEARS IN CURRENT ROLE	Responses	%
1 - 5	722	47.3
6 - 10	394	25.7
11 - 20	308	20.2
Above 20	52	3.4
Missing	52	3.4
Totals	1,528	100.0

Academic Discipline

Graduate degrees in education and business were most often reported by the survey respondents. Nearly as many respondents reported education and business disciplines as all other disciplines combined. Table 7 provides the frequency distributions for the six categories of academic disciplines that the questionnaire asked respondents to identify as closest to the discipline area of their highest degree.

Table 7

RESPONSES BY CATEGORIES OF ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE

ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE	Responses	%
Humanities, Law, Letters	239	15.6
Education, Business	664	43.5
Social Sciences	254	16.6
Engineering, Science, Medicine	188	12.3
Math	42	2.7
Other	93	6.1
Missing	48	3.2
Totals	1,528	100.0

Training in Planning Methods

About 15% of the administrators surveyed reported having received a substantial amount of formal training in planning methods, while about 16% reported taking no more than a college course in planning methods. Over 37% of respondents indicated

having attended conferences or seminars on planning. Twenty-seven percent reported having no formal training. Table 8 provides response distributions by categories of training in planning methods. Nearly one third of the respondents reported training at levels of at least one college course to a bachelors degree in a planning discipline.

Table 8

RESPONSES BY LEVELS OF TRAINING IN PLANNING METHODS

LEVEL OF TRAINING	Responses	%
None	417	27.3
Conference or Seminar	572	37.4
College Credit Course	251	16.4
Degree Minor, Internship	43	2.8
BA or Higher Degree	189	12.4
Missing	59	3.7
Totals	1,528	100.0

Senior Planning Officer

The staffing of a chief planning officer position was viewed in the research design as an indicator of an institution's level of commitment to a campus-wide formal planning process. Respondents indicated by a eight-to-five margin that their institutions did have the senior planning role staffed. This was most often the case among community college respondents and least often so for private college participants. Table 9 presents the

frequency distribution of responses to the question "Does your institution have a senior administrative officer whose principal duty is to coordinate institution-wide planning?"

Table 9

SENIOR PLANNING ROLE STAFFED?

IS ROLE STAFFED?	Responses	%
Yes	841	55.0
No	615	40.2
Missing	72	4.8
Totals	1,528	100.0

Planning Activities

The survey results indicate that wide participation in planning activities by administrators at all types of institutions is a common experience (Table 10).

Table 10

PARTICIPATION IN CAMPUS PLANNING

PLANNING ACTIVITY	YES N	YES %	NO N	NO %
Served on College-Wide Planning Committee	1,125	76	366	24
Evaluated/Advised on Plan	1,186	80	304	20
Provided Technical Analysis	856	57	635	43
Reviewed/Approved Plan	957	64	534	36
Responsible for Plan Implementation	1,052	71	439	29
Drafted Plan Proposal	939	63	552	37
None of Above	46	3	1,445	97

Necessity for Planning

Table 11 reflects the ranks and mean scores for all 1,528 respondents, who were asked in question number seven of the survey instrument to rank from 1 (Most Necessary) to 5 (Least Necessary) the indicated campus enrollment conditions.

Table 11

NECESSITY FOR PLANNING

RANK	CONDITION	Mean Score (Range 1 to 5)
1	Rapid Decline	2.3
2	Rapid Growth	2.9
3	Moderate Decline	3.3
4	Moderate Growth	3.9
5	Stability	4.2

Noteworthy is the trend in these rankings from least to most draconian enrollment conditions. This finding would suggest that administrators believe quite consistently that planning is most needed in "bad times' and least needed in 'good times."

Feasibility of Planning

Table 12 reflects the contrary view held by college and university administrators that planning is least feasible when it is most necessary (during "bad times") and most feasible when it is needed the least (during "good times").

As was true in Table 11, the nature and severity of enrollment problems define the degree of planning feasibility. The consensus supports the opinion that severe decline or growth problems bode

the greatest ill for carrying out institutional planning, in spite of the consensus view that these are the very conditions under which planning is most necessary.

Table 12

FEASIBILITY OF PLANNING

RANK	CONDITION	Mean Score (Range 1 to 5)
1	Stability	3.9
2	Moderate Growth	3.7
3	Moderate Decline	3.2
4	Rapid Growth	2.7
5	Rapid Decline	2.3

Reasons for Planning

Table 13 provides the ranks and mean scores for seven reasons for planning included in questionnaire item number eight.

Table 13

REASONS FOR PLANNING

RANK	REASON	Mean Score (Range 1 to 7)
1	Establish Institutional Priorities	2.2
2	Ensure Means, Objectives are Defined	2.6
3	Identify Emerging Issues	3.4
4	Develop Programs and Services	3.8
5	Improve Communication	3.9
6	Enhance Institutional Efficiency	4.5
7	External Influences, Forces	5.5

Respondents were asked to rank these reasons for planning from 1 (most important) to 7 (least important). Those reasons judged most important were ones most directly associated with the planning function. Secondary consequences of planning, such as improvement in communications and campus efficiencies, were commonly seen as less important than setting campus priorities and having clearly defined means and objectives.

Contingency Table Analysis

Cross-tabulation of variables that are highly correlated reveal some relationships that support the research hypotheses and theoretical framework for the research.

Table 14

PLANNING ATTITUDE BY
DECISION MAKING ATTITUDE

PLANNING ATTITUDE	DECISION MAKING ATTITUDE		
	Oligarchic	Pluralistic	Democratic
C/P	64.5 %	32.9 %	15.9%
Mixed	34.7 %	59.4 %	40.9 %
I/R	.8 %	7.7 %	43.2 %
	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %

Planning attitude and decision making attitude were re-coded to form composite variables with three categories. The categories of planning attitude are: Comprehensive-Prescriptive (values 1 - 3 on the planning attitude scales), Mixed (values 4 - 6) and Incremental-Remedial (values 7 - 9). The categories of decision

making attitude are: Oligarchic (values 1 - 3 on the decision making attitude scales), Pluralistic (values 4 - 6) and Democratic (values 7 - 9). Table 14 provides the distribution of responses for these categories when combined through a contingency table analysis.

The relationship of decision making and planning attitudes clearly indicates that attitudes are parallel and consistent along these dimensions.

Table 15

PERCEPTION OF CAMPUS PLANNING PRACTICES
BY PERCEPTION OF CAMPUS DECISION MAKING

	PERCEIVED DECISION MAKING		
PLANNING PRACTICES	Oligarchic	Pluralistic	Democratic
C/P	31.2 %	10.4 %	8.3%
Mixed	60.9 %	73.1 %	45.0 %
I/R	7.8 %	16.5 %	46.7 %
	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %

Table 15 illustrates that the range of differences in categories is less extensive, with more administrators falling into the Mixed category of perceived campus planning practices and more in the Pluralistic category of perceived campus decision making processes. This finding tends to support the theoretical assumption that the decision making environment on college campuses is most often pluralistic in nature and that planning processes are apt to mirror the underlying decision making values and processes that are predominant.

Table 16 reveals the relationship between the perceived limitations to planning on a campus and the way the campus planning processes are viewed on the comprehensive-prescriptive to incremental-remedial continuum.

Table 16

PERCEPTION OF CAMPUS PLANNING PRACTICES
BY PERCEPTION OF CONSTRAINTS ON THE PLANNING PROCESS

PLANNING PRACTICES	PERCEIVED CONSTRAINTS ON PLANNING		
	Minor	Moderate	Major
C/P	41.5 %	10.0 %	4.4%
Mixed	54.5 %	74.7 %	57.7 %
I/R	3.9 %	15.3 %	38.0 %
	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %

These results indicate a strong relationship between one's perception of the severity of the limitations to planning on the campus and one's perception of the nature of planning being conducted.

Table 17

PERCEPTION OF CAMPUS PLANNING PRACTICES
BY PLANNING ATTITUDE

PLANNING PRACTICES	PLANNING ATTITUDE		
	C/P	Mixed	I/R
C/P	33.2 %	8.4 %	21.0 %
Mixed	55.9 %	77.8 %	48.1 %
I/R	10.9 %	13.9 %	30.9 %
	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %

In contrast to the comparisons of planning and decision making attitudes, this table reveals that a far greater percentage of administrators perceive their campuses' actual planning processes to be Mixed or Incremental-Remedial than Comprehensive-Prescriptive, almost regardless of their underlying planning attitude. Similar results occur when actual planning orientation is compared to planning attitude.

Finally, when planning attitudes are compared to administrative roles, and subsequently perception of campus planning practices are compared to roles, an even more dramatic shift occurs. 41 % of chief executives hold comprehensive-prescriptive attitudes compared to only 6 % incremental-remedial. However, only 16.7 % of chief executive officers perceive their campuses to plan comprehensively, while 65.7 % see their campuses using mixed approaches and 17.6 % see their campuses as planning in incremental-remedial ways. More than any other role category, chief executive officers perceived their campus as planning with incremental-remedial approaches.

Regression Analysis

The regression models have been tested in the pilot study (1985) and have been found to provide a useful means for examining and predicting planning attitudes and orientations. These models are shown below:

$$Y1\ (PLAT) = A\ (ENROLL) + B\ (TYPE) + C\ (YRHE) + D\ (DISC) + E\ (TRNG) + F\ (TITLE) + G\ (YRRO) + H\ (ACTIV) + I\ (DMAT) + J\ (PAPP).$$

Y2 (PAPP) = A (ENROLL) + B (TYPE) + C (YRHE) + D (DISC) +
E (TRNG) + F (TITLE) + G (YRRO) + H (ACTIV) +
I (PCPP) + J (PADM) + K (PLAT).

Y3 (APOR) = A (ENROLL) + B (TYPE) + C (YRHE) + D (DISC) +
E (TRNG) + F (TITLE) + G (YRRO) + H (ACTIV) +
I (PCPP) + J (DMAT) + K (PADM) + L (PLAT) +
M (PAPP).

Planning Attitude Model

Each model has a continuous measure dependent variable. The variables were each given an acronym or short name, required to label variables for computer processing. The variable names and SPSS/PC+ labels used have been defined in Chapter II, Theoretical Framework. The planning attitude score, labeled PLAT, was calculated using the SPSS/PC+ COMPUTE instruction. The first five of the six response items for question number 11 on the survey questionnaire (questions 11A through 11E) were summed to arrive at a composite score. Question 11F, the sixth response item in the planning attitude scale series of questions was used to assess the validity of the composite score. This question asked respondents to indicate their attitude about the ideal approach to planning along the continuum from comprehensive-prescriptive to incremental-remedial. The scores for question 11F, the Better Approach to Planning, were regressed on the composite score for questions 11A through 11E.

The results indicate that the sum of the five separate items is a very good predictor of the straightforward question about the respondents' attitudes concerning the best planning approach. Table 18 reflects these findings.

Table 18

MULTIPLE REGRESSION
Summary Table

PLANNING ATTITUDE SCALE
Dependent Variable PLAT6
Attitude About the Better Approach to Planning

Step	Variable	Mult R	R^2	F	Sig F	Beta In
1	PLAT1	.52647	.27717	539.9	.000	.52647
2	PLAT5	.61024	.37239	417.4	.000	.34155
3	PLAT4	.64027	.40994	325.6	.000	.23834
4	PLAT3	.65465	.42857	263.4	.000	.16418
5	PLAT2	.66162	.43774	218.6	.000	.12797

Similar results were found for the perception of campus planning practices scale, PAPP.

Table 19

MULTIPLE REGRESSION
Summary Table

PERCEPTION OF PLANNING PRACTICES SCALE
Dependent Variable PAPP6
Perception of Campus Actual Practice
Re: the Better Approach to Planning

Step	Variable	Mult R	R^2	F	Sig F	Beta In
1	PAPP1	.60068	.36081	796.5	.000	.60068
2	PAPP5	.68220	.46539	613.7	.000	.36596
3	PAPP3	.70912	.50285	475.1	.000	.22299
4	PAPP4	.71704	.51415	372.5	.000	.14261
5	PAPP2	.71832	.51599	299.9	.000	.05692

The scores for variables PLAT1 through PLAT5 were summed to create a new single score for the planning attitude scale. This new variable was labeled PLAT and became the measure of the respondents' planning attitudes. The results of regressing PLAT on the separate items in the planning attitude scale, PLAT1 through

PLAT5, are listed in Table 20.

Table 20

MULTIPLE REGRESSION
Summary Table

PLANNING ATTITUDE SCALE
Dependent Variable PLAT
Attitude About the Better Approach to Planning

Step	Variable	Mult R	R^2	F	Sig F	Beta
1	PLAT6	.6410	.4108	2322.8	.000	.6410

Similar results were found for the PAPP scale.

Table 21
MULTIPLE REGRESSION
Summary Table

PERCEPTION OF PLANNING PRACTICES SCALE
Dependent Variable PAPP
Perception of Campus Actual Practice
Re: the Better Approach to Planning

Step	Variable	Mult R	R^2	F	Sig F	Beta
1	PAPP6	.6890	.4748	3010.9	.000	.6890

Finally, the scale score for planning attitude, PLAT, was regressed on the single item measure for planning attitude, PLAT6; and the scale score for perception of actual campus practice, PAPP, was regressed on the single item measure for perception of actual campus preference for the "better" approach to planning, PLAT6. The results are shown in table 22.

Table 22

MULTIPLE REGRESSION
Summary Table

PLANNING ATTITUDE SCALE
Dependent Variable PLAT
Attitude About the Better Approach to Planning

Step	Variable	Mult R	R^2	F	Sig F	Beta In
1	PLAT1	.7454	.5556	4163.9	.000	.7454
2	PLAT2	.8519	.7258	4406.7	.000	.5035
3	PLAT3	.9212	.8487	6222.3	.000	.4004
4	PLAT4	.9623	.9259	10400.1	.000	.3452
5	PLAT5	.9893	.9787	30577.7	.000	.2847

Similar results were found for the PAPP scale, as reflected in Table 23.

Table 23
MULTIPLE REGRESSION
Summary Table

PERCEPTION OF PLANNING PRACTICES SCALE
Dependent Variable PAPP
Perception of Campus Actual Practice
Re: the Better Approach to Planning

Step	Variable	Mult R	R^2	F	Sig F	Beta In
1	PAPP1	.7667	.5878	4749.3	.000	.7667
2	PAPP2	.8566	.7338	4588.6	.000	.4674
3	PAPP3	.9298	.8645	7078.1	.000	.4066
4	PAPP4	.9678	.9366	12300.1	.000	.3449
5	PAPP5	.9874	.9749	25880.3	.000	.2516

Regression Model I

The research hypothesized that administrators' attitudes about planning were predicted by the variables in Model I. Table 24 reveals that, although statistically significant, the model fails to explain approximately 72 % of the variation in the scale score

for the outcome variable, Planning Attitude.

The background variables, both institutional and personal, were included as control variables. The model sought to find a high percentage of explained variation above, or in addition to, the variation in planning attitude scores that was explained by campus enrollment size, institution type, the respondents' years experience in higher education, their role and years in role, their training in planning methods and their academic disciplines.

Model I postulated that attitudes about planning were closely associated with attitudes about decision making values and processes and with involvement in planning activities on the campus. The model also included the outcome variable for Model II, perception of actual campus planning practices, for the purpose of assessing their relationship, although perception of actual practices was not assumed to explain planning attitudes.

Table 24 reveals that there is little association between involvement in campus planning activities and one's planning attitude score. Conversely, there is a very strong association between administrators' planning attitude and decision making attitude scores. Over 22 % of the variation in planning attitude scores is explained by variation in decision making attitude scores. The clear association found between decision making and planning attitudes warrants further exploration in follow up research to be conducted by the Institutional Planning Project.

Table 24

MULTIPLE REGRESSION
Summary Table
Regression Model I

PLANNING ATTITUDE
Dependent Variable PLAT
Attitude About the Better Approach to Planning

Step	Variable	Mult R	R^2	F	Sig F	Beta In
1	ENROLL	.0544	.0030	4.5	.033	.0544
2	TYPE3					-.0353
3	TYPE2					-.0804
4	TYPE1	.0931	.0087	3.3	.010	-.0147
5	YRHE	.0931	.0087	2.7	.021	.0013
6	DISC5					.0046
7	DISC3					.0533
8	DISC4					-.0475
9	DISC1					.0108
10	DISC2	.1183	.0140	2.2	.018	.0294
11	TRNG4					.0034
12	TRNG2					-.0180
13	TRNG3					.0114
14	TRNG1	.1354	.0183	2.0	.014	.0926
15	TITLE1					-.0167
16	TITLE2					.0171
17	TITLE3					.0264
18	TITLE4	.1489	.0222	1.9	.013	.1111
19	YRRO	.1605	.0257	2.1	.004	-.0679
20	ACTIV	.1712	.0293	2.3	.001	-.0662
21	DMAT	.5006	.2506	23.9	.000	.4806
22	PAPP	.5313	.2823	26.9	.000	.1852

Because the association between these variables is positive, one can conclude that administrators with "oligarchic" decision making attitudes are highly likely to be strongly comprehensive-prescriptive in their planning attitudes. Similarly, administrators who have "democratic" decision making attitudes are highly likely to have incremental-remedial planning attitudes. This finding is further illustrated in Table ? which shows the results of contingency table analysis of these two variables.

Regression Model II

The research hypothesized that role and experience factors, as well as both perception of constraints upon planning in the campus environment and perception of the prevailing campus decision making values and processes, would explain in large part how administrators perceive planning on their campuses. Table 25 reveals that the effects of role and experience (TITLE, YRHE, YRRO) are not great, whereas the effects of perceived constraints upon planning and the perceived dominant decision making approach at the campus are very significant.

As was true of regression Model I, Model II explains only about 35 % of the variation in the scores of the outcome variable, Perception of Actual Planning Practices. Some 65 % of the variation in this measure is unexplained by the model. The model does predict the outcome variable at a significant level for the statistic F. However, the large unexplained variation in the outcome, or dependent, variable indicates that solely knowing the characteristics of the model's variables does not lead to a full explanation of how such perceptions are apt to vary.

One may speculate that perceptions of campus planning practices will vary with actual variations in campus planning approaches that were not revealed by the measures used in this model. The Institutional Planning Project will attempt to discover other plausible explanations for this variation in perceptions during the campus site visit phase of the project.

Table 25

MULTIPLE REGRESSION
Summary Table
Regression Model II

PERCEPTION OF PLANNING PRACTICES
Dependent Variable PAPP
Perception of Campus Actual Practice
Re: the Better Approach to Planning

Step	Variable	Mult R	R^2	F	Sig F	Beta In
1	ENROLL	.0703	.0049	7.5	.006	.0703
2	TYPE3					.0331
3	TYPE2					-.0029
4	TYPE1	.0775	.0060	2.3	.057	.0090
5	YRHE	.1143	.0131	4.0	.001	-.0851
6	DISC5					.0327
7	DISC3					.0477
8	DISC4					.0234
9	DISC1					-.0007
10	DISC2	.1309	.0171	2.6	.003	.0291
11	TRNG4					.0327
12	TRNG2					-.0105
13	TRNG3					-.0035
14	TRNG1	.1417	.0201	2.2	.006	.0624
15	TITLE1					-.0840
16	TITLE2					.0257
17	TITLE3					.0009
18	TITLE4	.1678	.0282	2.4	.001	.0439
19	YRRO	.1964	.0386	3.2	.000	-.1157
20	ACTIV	.3032	.0413	3.2	.000	-.0579
21	PCPP	.5346	.2858	28.7	.000	.5100
22	PADM	.5785	.3346	34.4	.000	.2367
23	PLAT	.5937	.3525	35.6	.000	.1417

Regression Model III

Table 26 reveals that the variables in the model still only account for 34 % of the variation in the outcome variable labeled Actual Planning Orientation.

Table 26

MULTIPLE REGRESSION
Summary Table
Regression Model III

PLANNING ORIENTATION
Dependent Variable APOR
Perception of Campus Actual Practice
Re: the Better Approach to Planning

Step	Variable	Mult R	R^2	F	Sig F	Beta In
1	ENROLL	.0751	.0056	8.7	.003	.0751
2	TYPE3					-.0031
3	TYPE2					-.0549
4	TYPE1	.0879	.0077	2.9	.019	.0013
5	YRHE	.1012	.0103	3.1	.008	-.0510
6	DISC5					.0235
7	DISC3					.0596
8	DISC4					-.0153
9	DISC1					.0038
10	DISC2	.1226	.0150	2.3	.011	.0407
11	TRNG4					.0203
12	TRNG2					-.0170
13	TRNG3					.0010
14	TRNG1	.1425	.0203	2.2	.005	.1003
15	TITLE1					-.0616
16	TITLE2					.0289
17	TITLE3					.0170
18	TITLE4	.1650	.0272	2.3	.001	.0982
19	YRRO	.1909	.0364	3.0	.000	-.1088
20	ACTIV	.2030	.0412	3.2	.000	-.0767
21	PCPP	.4492	.2017	18.1	.000	.4132
22	DMAT	.5525	.3053	30.0	.000	.3400
23	PADM	.5840	.3411	33.8	.000	.2131
24	PLAT	.8698	.7566	194.7	.000	.7504
25	PAPP	.9958	.9916	7095.5	.000	.6048

The research had hypothesized that one's planning orientation reflected one's attitudes about planning, tempered by one's perceptions of the real world possibilities for carrying out those fundamental beliefs. Therefore, Model III combined the scale scores for planning attitude (PLAT) and for perception of actual planning practices (PAPP) to create a measure for planning

orientation.

The results of the regressing Actual Planning Orientation on the variables in the model appear in Table 26. Regression analysis does not support a conclusion that one's role or one's experience materially aid in explaining variation in the outcome variable, actual planning orientation. Further, the model fails to explain approximately 66 % of the variation in these planning orientation scores.

However, the model does clearly reveal that, of the variables in the model, perception of campus constraints upon planning (PCPP) and both attitudes about and perceptions of actual campus decision making processes (DMAT and PADM) are good predictors of administrators' planning orientations.

Controlling for Institution Size

Because the pilot study indicated that institution size may function to suppress the relationship between the outcome variables and the mediating variables in the three regression equations, the models were tested while controlling for campus enrollment size. Such a function would disguise an actual relationship between the outcome and the mediating variables in the model. If such a function were at work, controlling for institutional size would result in higher R^2 values for the equations. When the equations were again tested for groups of administrators from institutions of, respectively, less than 5,000 students and greater than 20,000 students, the results were virtually identical to those obtained

when all respondents were included in the analysis.

Planning Attitude (PLAT), Perception of Actual Planning Practices (PAPP), and Actual Planning Orientation (APOR) were found in this analysis to have nearly the same unexplained variation when responses from small institutions were analyzed separately from large institutions. For example, the R^2 value for Model III, when responses from small institutions only were included, was .3752, whereas this value was .3411 when all responses were included in the analysis. This means that .6248 of the variation in the Actual Planning Orientation Score is explained only by the responses to questions that comprise the scale score, (variables PLAT and PAPP), rather than by the mediating variables in the regression model. For Model I, the R^2 value for planning attitude (PLAT) was .3356 and for Model II, the R^2 value for perception of campus actual planning practice (PAPP) was .3612, when only small institution responses were included.

The same set of analyses was performed for responses from administrators from institutions larger than 20,000 students. In these tests, the R^2 value for Model III, actual planning orientation (APOR), was .3415. The R^2 value for Model I, planning attitude (PLAT) was .2956. The R^2 value for Model II, perception of actual campus planning practices (PAPP) was .3418.

These results indicate that the regression models generally fail to explain the basis for variation in administrator attitudes and perceptions about their campuses' approaches to planning.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The survey results indicate that there is a wide range of attitudes held by college and university administrators about planning values and processes. Similarly, administrators' perceptions of their campus' actual approaches to planning tend to vary widely.

Broad participation in planning activities was found to be a common experience among all types of survey respondents. By and large, noteworthy agreement exists on the ranking of the most and least important reasons for planning in our nation's colleges and universities. Broad agreement was also found on the enrollment and financial conditions that are most and least conducive to successfully conducting institution-wide planning.

The Institutional Planning Project research design included a supposition that planning practices would vary among institutions of such disparate sizes. It was also hypothesized that the perceptions of these practices that are held by campus administrators would also vary significantly. The survey findings appear to bear out this supposition, especially with respect to the perception of time constraints upon planning imposed by the campus environment.

An inverse relationship was found between the conditions under which planning was believed to be most necessary and the relative feasibility of successfully conducting planning. When

stable or moderate growth in enrollment and financial conditions characterize an institution's status, college and university administrators consider planning to be most feasible. Conversely, rapid decline and rapid growth conditions were seen as those when planning was most needed. This dilemma will be further explored in the site visit phase of the project, with the aim of discovering how institutions experiencing each of these enrollment and financial trends have actually responded through their planning processes to the problems and opportunities that these conditions presented.

The reasons campuses plan were ranked, on balance, from direct and traditional purposes as most important, to second-order reasons and good-management effects of planning as least important. Establishing priorities for the campus was ranked first, followed by setting specific means to accomplish campus objectives, identifying emerging issues that may affect the campus, and providing a framework for developing and improving programs. Improving communication and efficiency and responding to external agencies were ranked as the least important reasons for planning.

Campus decision processes were most often perceived at all types of institutions to be controlled centrally by an elite group of decision makers. This group's membership was seen as stable and a clear and persistent distinction was perceived on campuses between this group of central decision makers and those who do not exercise great influence over campus policy. Unity of interests

among campus leaders in support of the institution's chief goals was perceived to be strong at all types of institutions, although it was strongest at private colleges and weakest at research universities.

This finding will also be explored further in the site visits. It seems to suggest that large, more pluralistic institutions may require planning processes that involve a wide range of groups, whereas the more integrated campus culture of smaller, private colleges may call for a more top-down and centrally-directed planning process.

Similarly, site visits might explore in greater depth the finding that points to a possible relationship between the culture of community colleges and the perceived influence of individual faculty and staff members on campus leaders. In spite of the centralized decision making nature of college campuses perceived by most respondents, individuals were seen to have substantial influence on campus leaders.

Institutional type appears also to affect how campus administrators perceive constraints upon the planning process. Time constraints appear to be greatest for research universities, while resource constraints appear most significant for state colleges and understanding of the subject and implications of policy decisions are viewed as more constraining by community colleges and state colleges. The possibility of reaching common agreement on institutional goals was not perceived to be a significant constraint by respondents from any of the four types of

institutions.

Attitudes among all respondents generally favor systematic, long-range, comprehensive planning processes that use analytical and technical problem-solving and decision methods. However, administrators tend to perceive that their campuses approach planning in a far more incremental, short-range, and laissez faire manner, and are driven by political or market considerations in making policy decisions.

Respondents' attitudes vary significantly from their perceptions of how campuses actually respond to six planning process and value issues: response to change, reducing risk and uncertainty, explicit goal definition, methods of reaching agreement on goals, the campus' main objective in planning, and the campus' preference among the continuum of possible planning approaches. The contrast between these perceptions by campus leaders about their own campus planning processes and their beliefs about what is the best or correct way to plan also points to a fertile area of inquiry during the project's campus site visits.

The data offer no opportunity to resolve the question of whether any particular approach to planning is the "ideal" approach. The debate over the relative appropriateness of technical/analytical versus market/political planning methods will probably persist as long as attitudes vary about the merit of these approaches.

Planning orientations among college and university administrators, from presidents to registrars, are quite diverse.

These orientations seem to be rooted both in the perceived realities of the campus planning environment and the individual's preference among decision making styles and governing processes. It appears unlikely that any one planning system or approach will suit the needs of all types of institutions or the preferences of all administrators.

Actual campus planning practices are perceived to be more pluralistic and market-oriented than respondents believed were the ideal or correct approach to planning. Confirmation and elaboration of this finding should be obtained during campus site visits.

There appears to be broad scale participation in planning at all administrative levels.

There is general agreement on the most and least important reasons for planning.

The dilemma between the perception of conditions under which planning is most feasible (during "good times") and most necessary (during "bad times"), may suggest that formal planning be actively pursued chiefly during periods of campus stability or gradual growth in enrollment and finances. This also suggests that crisis management will prevail during periods of rapid growth or decline, and that more systematic approaches to planning may be less practical during such stages of a campus' life.

Finally, the site visits should further explore the degree to which administrators perceive that it is practical and wise to vary the campus planning approach to accommodate the styles of new

leaders, development and changes in the institution's culture, and changes in the environmental context and in the institution's financial and enrollment circumstances.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY DOCUMENTS

1. Cover Page
2. Questionnaire
3. Letter to Presidents
4. Sponsoring Associations and Letter

NATIONAL CENTER FOR POSTSECONDARY GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE

6525 Belcrest Road, Suite 430, Hyattsville, Maryland 20782 (301) 454-1568
Richard P. Chait, Executive Director; Nolen Ellison, Chairman, National Advisory Panel

A National Survey of Planning Perspectives and Practices in American Colleges and Universities

The National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance is conducting a three-year research project on planning perspectives and practices in American higher education institutions. Joint sponsors of the project include the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the Association of American Universities, the Council of Independent Colleges, the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, and the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities and the National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities.

The National Center is a research consortium of four universities headquartered at the University of Maryland's College Park campus, near Washington, D.C. The Center was established on December 1, 1985 with funding from the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement. The Center's mission is to conduct research on the effectiveness, efficiency, and equity of governance, management and finance practices in higher education. Findings from the Center's research will be made available in forms useful to higher education practitioners, policy makers and scholars.

The Center's research agenda includes three broad programs: 1) national trends and external factors that affect campuses, 2) internal campus governance, management and finance processes, and 3) concepts in organization theory that have relevance to higher education practice and research.

The attached survey is the initial step in a three-year research project dealing with institution-wide planning processes. The major goal of this project is to develop practical guidelines and recommendations for administrators and policy makers responsible for institutional planning. The guidelines will address the design, implementation and assessment of planning approaches and processes. Recommendations will be based upon project findings about factors that affect planning in a variety of institutional settings. The information developed in this project could be of significant assistance to administrators seeking to initiate, improve, or evaluate institutional planning activities and it could aid scholars attempting to develop realistic planning methodologies. The National Center will prepare and disseminate assessments of the potential strengths and weaknesses of current planning theories as well as practical guidelines and recommendations derived from the research.

Your institution is among the 256 colleges and universities selected to participate in the survey research phase of this project. In addition to this survey, project activities include a comprehensive review and analysis of case studies and empirical research on institutional planning experiences. Also, an in-depth examination will be made of planning perspectives and activities at 16 institutions of different types and governance patterns.

Your personal participation in this research is very important. To assure that the findings are valid and that the recommendations developed from the research are useful to the American higher education community, please take 15 minutes to respond to the questions enclosed. No special knowledge about planning is required. No specific data or facts are required. Please complete the questionnaire even if your campus has no formal institutional planning process.

Thank you for supporting and participating in this study.

Executive Office: University of Maryland, College Park
Research Centers at: Arizona State University; University of Maryland, College Park; Teachers College, Columbia University; University of Wisconsin, Madison

NATIONAL CENTER FOR POSTSECONDARY GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE
6525 Belcrest Road, Suite 430, Hyattsville, Maryland 20782 (301) 454-1568
Robert O. Berdahl, Acting Executive Director, Nolen Ellison, Chairman, National Advisory Panel

_____
Control Number

The Institutional Planning Project Survey on
PLANNING PERSPECTIVES AND PRACTICES

Introduction

Research and literature on planning reveals that the perspectives of faculty, staff and trustees about the effectiveness and desirability of planning practices are apt to vary by institution and by planning situation. This survey seeks to develop a better understanding of these perspectives.

The study focuses primarily upon broad, campus-wide planning issues. Such issues include: defining the academic mission of a campus, developing or changing a campus' programs of instruction, research, and service, and coordinating academic plans with a campus' long-range operating and capital (facilities) budgets and fund-raising programs. Therefore, the study addresses strategies and approaches taken to position a college or university to carry out its formal mission, achieve major policy objectives, and pursue long-term goals that have broad implications for the institution.

This study does **not** focus on other, less global, planning activities, such as those dealing with annual operating budgets, design and construction of buildings, student admissions and retention, campus transportation, computer and information systems, or affirmative action and equal educational opportunity, except when a campus treats them as components of a broader planning effort.

---

1. How many YEARS have you held a FACULTY, ADMINISTRATIVE or TRUSTEE ROLE with any institution? _____ Years

2. Which of the categories below is closest to the DISCIPLINE AREA of your HIGHEST DEGREE?

☐ Humanities, Law, Letters ☐ Education, Business ☐ Social Sciences ☐ Engineering, Science, Medicine ☐ Math ☐ Other

3. How many YEARS EXPERIENCE do you have in your current position? _____

4. If you have had any specialized TRAINING in PLANNING METHODS, please indicate the highest level.

☐ None ☐ Conference, Non-Credit Seminar ☐ College Credit Course ☐ Degree Minor, Internship ☐ Bachelors or Higher Degree Major

5. Does your institution have a senior administrative officer whose principal duty is to coordinate institution-wide planning? ☐ Yes ☐ No

6. Please check all of the planning activities listed below in which **you** have **personally participated** at any postsecondary education institution.

☐ College wide planning committee member
☐ Evaluate and offer advice about a plan
☐ Provide statistical or other technical analysis of a planning issue
☐ Review and approve a plan
☐ Hold administrative responsibility for plan implementation
☐ Draft a plan proposal
☐ None of the above

7. Various possible states of a campus' enrollments are grouped into five types below. Please rank them from one to five according to (A) how **necessary** planning is in each of these five situations and (B) how **feasible** planning is in each of these situations.

1 = Most Necessary
5 = Least Necessary

1 = Most Feasible
5 = Least Feasible

(A) Necessary to Plan	Finances and Enrollments Characterized by	(B) Feasible to Plan
____	Rapid growth	____
____	Moderate growth	____
____	Stability	____
____	Moderate decline	____
____	Rapid decline	____

8. Please rank from one to seven the following reasons for conducting campus-wide planning.
1 = Most Important 7 = Least Important

— To improve communication, cooperation and coordination among campus organizational units.

— To establish institutional priorities.

— To enhance institutional efficiency.

— To develop and improve programs and services.

— To ensure that the institution has defined specific means to accomplish its mission, goals and objectives.

— To identify emerging issues and to assess and adapt to changing trends and conditions in the campus' external environment.

— To provide evidence to trustees, state coordinating boards, and accrediting agencies that the campus has a mission and has a program to pursue it.

9. Below are five pairs of statements about DECISION MAKING. Please circle one of the numbers on each scale. Indicate where on the scale your institution's approach to broad, campus-wide planning decisions **actually** IS and **your attitude** about what ideally, the approach to planning decisions SHOULD BE.

A. **Stability of Group Influence**

Stable and Persistent
Policy issues come and go with time, but the same group (is) (should be) in control of nearly all of them.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
IS (at your campus)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
SHOULD BE (your attitude)

Fragmented and Non-Persistent
The group with the greatest influence on a policy decision (is) (should be) varied as the issue to be decided changes.

B. **Identity of Influential Persons**

Stable and Persistent
There (is) (should be) a clear and persistent distinction between those who influence decisions and those who do not.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
IS (at your campus)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
SHOULD BE (your attitude)

Variable and Issue Dependent
Until one knows the issue and whose interests are affected, there (is) (should be) no way to tell who will have a controlling influence on a decision.

C. **Location of Power to Influence Policy**

Concentrated at the Top
Power (is) (should be) concentrated at the top of the institution for nearly all kinds of issues.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
IS (at your campus)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
SHOULD BE (your attitude)

Diffused Among Groups
Power follows leadership. No one group (is) (should be) nearly always able to dominate the decision making process.

D. **Unity of Interests**

A Common Interest Unites Campus Leaders
Leaders (are) (should be) in agreement upon and support the common interests of the institution as a whole.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
ARE (at your campus)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
SHOULD BE (your attitude)

Campus Leaders Support Competing Interests
Basic values do not unite leaders around a common interest. Instead, leaders (are) (should be) in competition to influence decisions which affect their own groups.

E. **Individual's Influence Upon Decision Makers**

Small
Institutional decision makers generally (are) (should be) not swayed by individual faculty or staff member's efforts to influence them.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
ARE (at your campus)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
SHOULD BE (your attitude)

Great
Individual faculty or staff members can influence institutional decision makers and (are) (should be) frequently successful.

10. Below, four factors are listed that may impose LIMITATIONS TO PLANNING. Please give your opinion of how these limitations **affect the conduct of planning** at your campus on broad, campus-wide academic issues. Please circle a number on the scale between each pair of statements.

A. **Time for Analysis**

Enough
There is usually adequate time for analysis before making decisions.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not Enough
There is rarely adequate time for analysis prior to making decisions.

B. **Knowledge**

Sufficient
We usually know enough about the subject matter of policy decisions, their implications and their likely outcomes to plan realistically.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not Sufficient
We rarely know enough about the subject matter or future consequences of policy decisions to be sure plans are realistic.

C. **Resources for Planning**

Readily Available
Sufficient resources for planning (e.g., funds, data, computers, research, authority and analytical talent) are usually available and accessible.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Unavailable
Sufficient resources for planning (funds, data, computers, research, authority and analytical talent) are usually either lacking or are not accessible.

D. **Institutional Goal Consensus**

Possible
Agreement on goals for an institution is possible and probable if the goals are clearly defined.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not Possible
Wide agreement on goals is practically impossible because of competing group interests, changing needs, and changing views of what ought to be done.

11. Below are six pairs of statements about PLANNING PROCESSES AND VALUES. Please circle one of the numbers on each of the two scales. Indicate what the planning processes and values **actually** ARE at your institution and **your attitude** about what they SHOULD BE when dealing with broad, campus-wide academic issues.

A. **Response to Change**

Systematic and Long-Range
Comprehensive plans, computer models and systematic analysis (are) (should be) used to meet deadlines, forecast futures and anticipate changing requirements.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
ARE (at your campus)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
SHOULD BE (your attitude)

Incremental and Short-Range
Incremental plans, continuous adaptation, and bargaining (are) (should be) used to maintain the flexibility necessary to discover and take advantage of emerging opportunities.

B. **Reducing Risks and Uncertainty**

Quantitative Analysis
Quantitative methods (are) (should be) used to reduce risks and uncertainties by forecasting policy outcomes. Marginal adjustment plans fail to consider needs for major changes.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
ARE (at your campus)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
SHOULD BE (your attitude)

Marginal Adjustments
Successive limited comparisons and marginal adjustments (are) (should be) used to reduce risks and uncertainties. Quantitative methods over-simplify reality and often ignore things not easily quantified, which can increase short and long-term risks.

C. **Defining Goals**

Explicitly
Goals (are) (should be) defined explicitly and stated in precise terms.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
ARE (at your campus)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
SHOULD BE (your attitude)

Implicitly
Goals (are) (should be) known implicitly and stated in general terms.

D. **Reaching consensus on Priorities**

By Quantitative Analysis of Needs
Consensus agreements (are) (should be) achieved through quantitative analysis of needs and resources and through objective ranking of institutional priorities.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
ARE (at your campus)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
SHOULD BE (your attitude)

By Bargaining and Compromise
Consensus agreements (are) (should be) achieved through bargaining and compromise over institutional priorities and the priorities of various groups within the institution whose interests are at stake.

E. **Main Objective of Planning**

Optimum Choices
Planning's main objective (is) (should be) identifying and choosing the measurably best responses to emerging issues.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
IS (at your campus)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
SHOULD BE (your attitude)

Satisfactory Choices
The main objective of planning (is) (should be) discovering acceptable, and judgmentally appropriate responses to emerging issues.

F. **Better Approach to Planning**

Comprehensive/Prescriptive
Planning (is) (should be) long-range, comprehensive and detailed, to avoid the fragmentation and mistakes of trial and error approaches.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
IS (at your campus)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
SHOULD BE (your attitude)

Incremental/Remedial
Planning (is) (should be) short-range, limited in scope and adaptative to avoid the time, information costs and procedural rigidities of comprehensive approaches.

Thank you for participating. Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope today.

October 31, 1986

&NAME2&
&TITLEB&
&INST&
&STREET/O&
&CITY& &STATE& &ZIP&

Dear &NAME1&:

The National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance is conducting a survey on planning perspectives and practices in American higher education. Enclosed are two surveys. One is for you to complete and the other is for a member of your governing board.

As you will see from the information sheet we have enclosed, our project is an ambitious one. It is very important that we have the opinions of presidents and trustees included in our research. Therefore, we would appreciate your taking time to complete the survey yourself (it will only take a few moments and requires no data or detailed knowledge of planning methods) and to select a member of your board of trustees to also complete the survey.

The second survey form enclosed should be completed and returned directly by the trustee you select. Two postage-paid return envelopes are provided for your and your trustee's use.

If you would like additional information about our project, or about the National Center, or if you would like copies of the results of the survey, please write to us; or you may simply return a note with your completed survey, or call the Center. We will be pleased to hear from you.

Thank you for your help and for your participation in the institutional planning project.

Sincerely,

Frank A. Schmidtlein
Project Director

Research Staff
Jon H. Larson
Toby H. Milton
Jane Fiori

Sponsoring Associations
Institutional Planning Project

Dr. Dale Parnell, President
American Association of Community
and Junior Colleges
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Suite 410
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dr. Robert M. Rosenzweig, President
Association of American Universities
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Suite 730
Washington, D.C. 20026

Dr. John D. Phillips, President
National Association of Independent
Colleges and Universities
122 C Street, N.W.
Suite 750
Washington, D.C. 20001

Dr. Harold Delaney, President
American Association of State
Colleges and Universities
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dr. Allan Splete, President
Council of Independent Colleges
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Suite 320
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dr. Samuel Myers, President
National Association for Equal
Opportunity in Higher Education
2243 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

NATIONAL CENTER FOR POSTSECONDARY GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE

6525 Belcrest Road, Suite 430, Hyattsville, Maryland 20782 (301) 454-1568
Richard P. Chait, Executive Director; Nolen Ellison, Chairman, National Advisory Panel

October 27, 1986

Dr. Dale Parnell, President
American Association of Community
and Junior Colleges
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Suite 410
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Dr. Parnell:

Enclosed is a copy of the National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance's Institutional Planning Project Survey. We greatly appreciate your association's willingness to be one of the sponsors for this project and believe that your support will help us obtain the responses needed to successfully complete our research.

In the next few weeks, we will be mailing approximately 3500 surveys to administrators and faculty at 256 educational institutions. As results from our survey data analyses become available, we will keep you informed. Our hope is that this research on planning perspectives and procedures will make a valuable contribution to the higher education community.

If any of your members have questions about the survey, or would like more information about our project, please do not hesitate to refer them to me.

Once again, thank you for your interest and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Frank A. Schmidtlein
Project Director

FAS/gps

Enclosure
bcc: Sal Corrallo

Copies of this letter also went to: Bob Rosenzweig, AAU; John Phillips, NAICU; Harold Delaney, AASCU; Allan Splete, CIC; and Samuel Myers, NAFEU.

APPENDIX B

DATA FILE FORMAT

DATA FILE FORMAT

```
DATA LIST FIXED FILE='GOODPLAN.DAT' TABLE

/ID 2-5  ENROLL 7-11  TYPE 13-14  TITLE 16-17  YRHE 19-20
 DISC 21  YRRO 22-23  TRNG 24  PLANVP 25  ACTIV1 TO ACTIV7 26-32
 NECESS1 TO NECESS5 33-37  FEAS1 TO FEAS5 38-42  REASON1 TO REASON7
 43-49  PADM1 TO PADM5 50-54  DMAT1 TO DMAT5 55-59  PCPP1 TO PCPP4
 60-63  PAPP1 TO PAPP6 64-69 PLAT1 TO PLAT6 70-75.

 VARIABLE LABELS   ID "Respondent's ID"

/ENROLL  'Fall 1985 FTE'
/TYPE  'Institution type'
/TITLE  "Respondent's title"
/YRHE  'Years experience in higher education'
/DISC  'Academic discipline'
/YRRO  'Years experience in current role'
/TRNG  'Training in planning methods'
/PLANVP  'Senior planning role staffed?'
/ACTIV1  'Served on college-wide planning committee'
/ACTIV2  'Evaluated and offered advice about plan'
/ACTIV3  'Provided technical analysis of planning issue'
/ACTIV4  'Reviewed and approved a plan'
/ACTIV5  'Responsible for plan implementation'
/ACTIV6  'Drafted a plan proposal'
/ACTIV7  'None of the above'
/NECESS1  'Necessity for planning during rapid growth'
/NECESS2  'Necessity for planning during moderate growth'
/NECESS3  'Necessity for planning during stability'
/NECESS4  'Necessity for planning during moderate decline'
/NECESS5  'Necessity for planning during rapid decline'
/FEAS1  'Feasibility of planning during rapid growth'
/FEAS2  'Feasibility of planning during moderate growth'
/FEAS3  'Feasibility of planning during stability'
/FEAS4  'Feasibility of planning during moderate decline'
/FEAS5  'Feasibility of planning during rapid decline'
/REASON1  'To improve communication, cooperation and coordination'
/REASON2  'To establish institutional priorities'
/REASON3  'To enhance institutional efficiency'
/REASON4  'To develop and improve programs and services'
/REASON5  'To ensure specific means defined to accomplish goals'
/REASON6  'To identify emerging trends in the campus environment'
/REASON7  'To provide evidence to external agencies'
/PADM1  'Perceived actual stability of group influence'
/PADM2  "Perceived actual identity of a 'power elite'"
/PADM3  'Perceived actual location of power to influence policy'
/PADM4  'Perceived actual unity of interests among leaders'
/PADM5  'Perceived actual influence upon leaders by individuals'
```

```
/DMAT1   'Attitude about the stability of group influence'
/DMAT2   "Attitude about existence of identifiable 'power elite'"
/DMAT3   'Attitude about location of power to influence policy'
/DMAT4   'Attitude about degree that leaders interests are unified'
/DMAT5   "Attitude about individuals' influence on leaders"
/PCPP1   "Perc'd planning constraint 'time needed for analysis'"
/PCPP2   "Perc'd planning constraint 'knowledge req'd to plan'"
/PCPP3   "Perc'd planning constraint 'resources req'd to plan'"
/PCPP4   "Perc'd planning constraint 'goal consensus possibility'"
/PAPP1   'Perceived actual campus approach to responding to change'
/PAPP2   'Perceived campus approach to reducing risk/uncertainty'
/PAPP3   'Perceived actual degree of explicit goal definition'
/PAPP4   'Perceived campus approach to reaching consensus on goals'
/PAPP5   'Perceived campus view of the main objective of planning'
/PAPP6   'Perceived campus view of the better approach to planning'
/PLAT1   'Attitude re: approaches to responding to change'
/PLAT2   'Attitude re: approaches to reducing risk and uncertainty'
/PLAT3   'Attitude re: approaches to defining goals'
/PLAT4   'Attitude re: approaches to reaching consensus on goals'
/PLAT5   'Attitude re: the main objective of planning'
/PLAT6   'Attitude re: the better approach to planning'.

 VALUE LABELS

/TYPE    01 'Research University-Private'
         02 'Research University-Public'
         03 'Private Liberal Arts College-Independent'
         04 'Private Liberal Arts College-Religious'
         05 'State College-System/Nonunion'
         06 'State College-System/Union'
         07 'State College-Nonsystem/Nonunion'
         08 'State College-Nonsystem/Union'
         09 'Community College-System/Nonunion'
         10 'Community College-System/Union'
         11 'Community College-Nonsystem/Nonunion'
         12 'Community College-Nonsystem/Union'

/TITLE   01 'Member, Board of Trustees'
         02 'Chief Executive Officer'
         03 'Chief Academic Officer'
         04 'Registrar'
         05 'Director of Admissions'
         06 'Head Librarian'
         07 'Director, Institutional Research'
         08 'Chief Business Officer'
         09 'Director, Computer Center'
         10 'Director, Alumni Relations'
         11 'Chief Development Officer'
         12 'Chief Student Services Officer'
         13 'Director of Counseling'
         14 'Director, Financial Aid'
         15 'Chief Planning Officer'
         16 'Dean'
         17 'Chair'
```

```
        18 'Director'


/DISC   1 'Hum, Law, Letters'
        2 'Educ, Bus'
        3 'Soc Sci'
        4 'Engr, Sci, Med'
        5 'Math'
        6 'Other'

/TRNG   1 'None'
        2 'Conf, non-credit seminar'
        3 'College credit course'
        4 'Deg minor, internship'
        5 'BA or higher degree major'

/PLANVP 1 'Yes'
        2 'No'

/ACTIV1 to ACTIV7   1 'Yes'
                    2 'No'

/PADM1,DMAT1    1 'Stable, persistent'
                9 'Fragmented, non-persistent'

/PADM2,DMAT2    1 'Stable, persistent'
                9 'Variable, issue-dependent'

/PADM3,DMAT3    1 'Concentrated at top'
                9 'Diffused among groups'

/PADM4,DMAT4    1 'Interests unite leaders'
                9 'No common interest exists'

/PADM5,DMAT5    1 'Small'
                9 'Great'

/PCPP1    1 'Enough'
          9 'Not enough'

/PCPP2    1 'Sufficient'
          9 'Not sufficient'

/PCPP3    1 'Readily available'
          9 'Unavailable'

/PCPP4    1 'Possible'
          9 'Not possible'

/PAPP1,PLAT1    1 'Systematic, long range'
                9 'Incremental, short range'

/PAPP2,PLAT2    1 'Quantitative analysis'
```

```
                9 'Marginal adjustments'

 /PAPP3,PLAT3   1 'Explicitly'
                9 'Implicitly'

 /PAPP4,PLAT4   1 'By analysis of needs'
                9 'By bargaining, compromise'

 /PAPP5,PLAT5   1 'Optimum choices'
                9 'Satisfactory choices'

 /PAPP6,PLAT6   1 'Comprehensive-prescriptive'
                9 'Incremental-remedial'.

MISSING VALUE   ALL (0).

 TITLE      'Institutional Planning Project'.

 SUBTITLE  'Data File Format and Description'.
```

REFERENCES

Alexis, M. and Wilson, C.Z. Organizational Decision Making. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Allison, G.T. Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis. Boston: Little, Brown, 1971.

Anthony, R.N. Planning and Control Systems: A Framework for Analysis. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Argyris, C. and Schon, D.A. Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1978.

Astin, A.W. "Measuring the Outcomes of Higher Education." In H. R. Bowen (Ed.), Evaluating Institutions for Accountability: New Directions for Institutional Research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Astley, W.G. and Van de Ven, A.H. "Central Perspectives and Debates in Organizational Theory." Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 245-273, 1983.

Bachrach, P. The Theory of Democratic Elitism, A Critique. Boston: Little, Brown, 1967.

Bachrach, P. and Baratz, M.S. "Two Faces of Power." The American Political Science Review, LVI, 947-952, 1962.

Backstrom, C.H. and Hursh, G.D. Survey Research. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1963.

Barnard, C.I. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bauer, R.A. and Gergan, K.J. (Eds.). The Study of Policy Formulation. New York: The Free Press, 1968.

Beer, S. Decision and Control: The Meaning of Operational Research and Management Cybernetics. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Bellah, R.N. "Social Science as Practical Reason." In D. Callahan and B. Jennings (Eds.), Ethics, The Social Sciences, and Policy Analysis. London: Plenum Press, 1983.

Bem, D.J. Beliefs, Attitudes, and Human Affairs. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1970.

Benveniste, G. The Politics of Expertise. (2nd ed.) Berkeley, CA: Glendessary, 1971.

Bertalanffy, L.V. Robots, Men and Minds, Psychology in the Modern World. New York: George Braziller, 1967.

Biddle, B.J. Role Theory: Expectations, Identities, and Behaviors. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Biderman, A. D. "Social Indicators and Goals." In R. A. Bauer (Ed.), Social Indicators. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1966.

Blalock, H.M., Jr. Causal Inferences in Non-experimental Research. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1964.

Blalock, H.M., Jr. Theory Construction. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Blau, P. M. and Scott, W. R. Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963.

Boulding, K. E. "The Ethics of Rational Decision." Management Science, 12, 1966, 161-169.

Bowen, H. R. The Costs of Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Bowen, H. R. Investment in Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Brandl, J.E. "Public Service Outputs for Higher Education: An Exploratory Essay." In B. Lawrence (Ed.), The Outputs of Higher Education. Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, 1970.

Braybrooke, D. and Lindblom, C.E. A Strategy of Decision: Policy Evaluation as a Social Process. New York: The Free Press, 1963.

Broms, H. and Gahmberg, H. "Communication to Self in Organizations and Cultures." Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 1983, 482- 495.

Campbell, D.T. and Stanley, J.S. "Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research on Teaching." In N.L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook for Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Campbell, A., Converse, P., Miller, W. and Stokes, D. The American Voter. New York: John Wiley, 1964.

Campbell, A., Converse, P., Miller, W. and Stokes, D. Elections and the Political Order. New York: John Wiley, 1966.

Churchman, C.W. The Systems Approach. New York: Dell, 1968.

Cnudde, C.F. and Neubauer, D.E. (Eds.). Empirical Democratic Theory. Chicago: Markham, 1969.

Cohen, A.R. Attitude Change and Social Influence. New York: Basic Books, 1964.

Cohen, M.D. and March, J.G. Leadership and Ambiguity. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Cohen, M.D., March, J.G. and Olsen, J.P. "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice." Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 1972, (1), 1-25.

Cook, T.D. "Quasi-Experimentation, Its Ontology, Epistemology and Methodology." In G. Morgan (Ed.), Beyond Method, Strategies for Social Research. London: Sage, 1983.

Cope, R.G. Strategic Planning, Management and Decision Making. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1981.

Cope, R.G. "A Contextual Model to Encompass the Strategic Planning Concept: Introducing a New Paradigm." In Planning for Higher Education, 13:3, 1985, 13-20.

Cope, R.G. and Morrison, J.L. "Using Futures Research Techniques in Strategic Planning: A Simulation." In Planning for Higher Education, 13:2, 1985, 5-9.

Cronbach, L.T. Designing Evaluations of Educational and Social Programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Dahl, R.A. "Hierarchy, Democracy, and Bargaining in Politics and Economics." In S.K. Bailey (Ed.), Research Frontiers in Politics and Government. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1955.

Dahl, R.A. A Preface to Democratic Theory. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Dahl, R.A. Modern Political Analysis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Dahl, R.A. and Lindblom, C.E. Politics, Economics, and Welfare. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Dahrendorf, R. Essays in the Theory of Society. Stanford, CA:

Stanford University Press, 1968.

Di Palma, G. and McClosky, H. "Personality and Conformity: The Learning of Political Attitudes." American Political Science Review, 64, 1970, 1054-1073.

Dyckman, J.W. "Planning and Decision Theory." Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 1961, 335-345.

Dye, T.R. Politics in States and Communities. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1981.

Eadie, D.C. "Putting a Powerful Tool to Practical Use: The Application of Strategic Planning in the Public Sector." Public Administration Review, 43, 1983, 447-452.

Easton, D. A Systems Analysis of Political Life. New York: John Wiley, 1965.

Eide, K. "The Planning Process." In S. Elam and G. Swanson (Eds.), Educational Planning in the United States. Itaska, IL: F.E. Peacock, 1969.

Etzioni, A. "Two Approaches to Organizational Analysis: A Critique and a Suggestion." Administrative Science Quarterly, 5, 1960, 257-278.

Etzioni, A. The Active Society. New York: The Free Press, 1968.

Etzioni, A. "Human Beings are Not Very Easy to Change After All." Saturday Review, June, 1972, 45-47.

Fayol, H. General and Industrial Management. London: Pitman, 1949.

Fenno, R. The Power of the Purse, Appropriations Politics in Congress. Boston: Little, Brown, 1966.

Festinger, L. A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Evanston, IL: Row-Peterson, 1957.

Freidland, E.I. Introduction to the Concept of Rationality in Political Science. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press, 1974.

Galbraith, J.K. American Capitalism: The Concept of Countervailing Power. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1952.

Gawthrop, L.C. Bureaucratic Behavior in the Executive Branch. New York: The Free Press, 1969.

Gawthrop, L.C. (Ed.). The Administrative Process and Democratic

Theory. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1970.

Georgiou, P. "The Goal Paradigm and Notes Toward a Counter Paradigm." Administrative Science Quarterly, 18, 1973, 191-310.

Ginsburg, G.P. "Role Playing and Role Performance in Social Psychological Research." In M. Brenner, P. Marsh and M. Brenner (Eds.), The Social Contexts of Method. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978.

Gore, W.J. Administrative Decision Making. New York: John Wiley, 1964.

Gross, E. and Grambsch, P.V. Changes in University Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Hartley, H.J. Educational Planning-Programming-Budgeting: A Systems Approach. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

Hayek, F.A. The Road to Serfdom: Are the Democracies Unknowingly Traveling the Totalitarian Road? Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1944.

Hayek, F.A. Studies in Philosophy, Politics, and Economics. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1967.

Hitch, C.J. Decision Making for Defense. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1965.

Hovland, C.I. and Rosenberg, M.J. (Eds.). Attitude Organization and Change: An Analysis of Consistency Among Attitude Components. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.

Jaros, D. and Grant, L.V. Political Behavior, Choices and Perspectives. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1974.

Jedamus, P. and Peterson, M.W. Improving Academic Management, A Handbook of Planning and Institutional Research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Jonas, H. "Economic Knowledge and Critique of Goals." In R. Heilbroner (Ed.), Economic Means and Social Ends. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Kahn, H. The Coming Boom: Economic, Political and Social. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982.

Kariel, H.S. Frontiers of Democratic Theory. New York: Random House, 1970.

Katz, D. and Kahn, R.L. The Social Psychology of Organizations.

New York: John Wiley, 1966.

Katz, E. and Lazarsfeld, P.F. Personal Influence. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press, 1955.

Keller, G. Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.

Kells, H.R. Self-Study Processes. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1980.

Kieft, R.N., Armijo, F. and Bucklew, N.S. A Handbook for Institutional Academic Planning: From Idea to Implementation. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1978.

Kirkpatrick, S.A. "Political Attitudes and Behavior: Some Consequences of Attitudinal Ordering." Midwest Journal of Political Science, 14,1970, 1-24.

Kuhn, T.S. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Landau, M. "Redundancy, Rationality, and the Problem of Duplication and Overlap." Public Administration Review, XXIX, 1969, 346-358.

Lane, R.E. Political Ideology, Why the American Common Man Believes What he Does. New York: The Free Press, 1962.

Lindblom, C.E. Politics and Markets: The World's Political Economic System. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Lindblom, C.E. The Policy Making Process. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

Lindblom, C.E. "The Science of Muddling Through." Public Administration Review, 19,1959,79-88.

Lindblom, C.E. and Cohen, D.K. Usable Knowledge, Social Science and Social Problem Solving. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.

Lindblom, C.E. and Braybrooke, D. The Intelligence of Democracy: Decision Making Through Mutual Adjustment. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Long, N.E. "The Local Community as an Ecology of Games." American Journal of Sociology, LXIV, 1958, 251-261.

Lyden, F.J. and Miller, E.G. Planning, Programming, Budgeting: A

System Approach to Management. Chicago: Markham, 1968.

Mannheim, K. Freedom, Power, and Democratic Planning. New York: Oxford University Press, 1950.

March, J.G. and Simon, H.A. Organizations. New York: John Wiley, 1958.

McGuire, W.J. "The Current Status of Cognitive Consistency Theories." In S. Feldman (Ed.), Cognitive Consistency: Motivational Antecedents and Behavioral Consequences. New York: Academic Press, 1969.

McGuire, W.J. "The Nature of Attitudes and Attitude Change." In G. Lindzey and E Aronson (Eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Merton, R.K. (Ed.). Reader in Bureaucracy. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press, 1952.

Michaels, R. Political Parties, A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press, 1915.

Milbrath, L. Political Participation. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Miller, D.C. Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. New York: David McKay, 1970.

Mingle, J.L. (Ed.). Challenges of Retrenchment. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Mises, L. von. "The Free Market Economy." In Human Action: A Treatise on Economics. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949.

Morrison, J.L., Renfro, W.L. and Boucher, W.I. Futures Research and the Strategic Planning Process: Implications for Higher Education. Higher Education Research Reports, Number 9. Washington,DC: ASHE-ERIC, 1984.

Mosca, G. The Ruling Class. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1939.

Mosher, F.C. Democracy and the Public Service. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Nagel, E. The Structure of Science, Problems in the Logic of Scientific Explanation. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961.

Neustadt, R.E. Presidential Power: The Politics of Leadership.

New York: John Wiley, 1960.

Newcomb, T., Koenig, K., Flacks, R. and Warwick, D. Persistence and Change: Bennington College and its Students After Twenty Five Years. New York: John Wiley, 1967.

Novick, D. Program Budgeting: Program Analysis and the Federal Budget. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Olson, M. The Logic of Collective Action, Public Goods and the Theory of Groups. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Ostrom, V. The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration. University, AL: The University of Alabama Press, 1974.

Pedhazur, E.J. Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research, Explanation and Prediction, (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1982.

Perrow, C. "The Analysis of Goals in Complex Organizations." American Sociological Review, 26, 1961, 854-866.

Pettigrew, T.F. "Social Psychology and Desegregation Research." American Psychologist, 16, 1961, 105-112.

Pfeffer, J. Power in Organizations. Marshfield, MA: Pitman, 1982.

Popper, K. The Open Society and Its Enemies. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950.

Presthus, R.V. Elites in the Policy Process. London: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

Presthus, R. The Organizational Society. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978.

Redford, E.S. Democracy in the Administrative State. New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Rejai, M. Democracy: The Contemporary Theories. New York: Atherton Press, 1967.

Richardson, R.C. and Gardner, D.E. "Designing a Cost-Effective Planning Process." Planning for Higher Education, 13:2, 1985, 10-13.

Rokeach, M. Beliefs, Attitudes and Values: A Theory of Organization and Change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Rosenberg, M.J. "An Analysis of Affective-Cognitive Consistency."

In C. Hovland and M. Rosenberg (Eds.), Attitude Organization and Change. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.

Rosenberg, M. The Logic of Survey Analysis. New York: Basic Books, 1968.

Schick, A. "The Road to PPB: Stages of Budget Reform." Public Administration Review, XXVI, 1966, 243-258.

Schick, A. "A Death in the Bureaucracy: The Demise of Federal PPB." Public Administration Review, 32, 1973, 146-156.

Schmidtlein, F.A. "Decision Process Paradigms in Higher Education." Educational Researcher, 3, 1974, 4-11.

Schultze, C.E. The Politics and Economics of Public Spending. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1968.

Sharkansky, I. (Ed.). Policy Analysis in Political Science. Chicago: Markham, 1970.

Simon, H.A. Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making in Administrative Organization. New York: The Free Press, 1945.

Taylor, F.W. Scientific Management. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1911.

Truman, D.B. The Governmental Process, Political Interests and Public Opinion. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951.

Vickers, G. The Art of Judgement: A Study of Policy Making. New York: Basic Books, 1965.

Wahlke, J.C. The Legislative System, Explorations in Legislative Behavior. New York: John Wiley, 1962.

Weber, M. "The Essentials of Bureaucratic Organization: An Ideal Type Construction." In T. Parsons (Ed.), The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Westerlund, G. and Sjostrand, S. Organizational Myths. New York: Harper and Row, 1979.

Wildavsky, A. "If Planning is Everything, Maybe It's Nothing." Policy Sciences, 4, 1973, 127-153.

Wildavsky, A. The Politics of the Budgetary Process. Boston: Little, Brown, 1964.